



**DRAFT**



City of Seattle

**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY  
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, January 10, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Michael DeBell, Susan Enfield, Sandi Everlove, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Cristina Gonzalez, Sheeba Jacob, Charles Knutson, Julie McCoy, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Amanda Allen (CBO), Wayne Barnett (SEEC), James Bush (HSD/MO), TJ Cosgrove (PHSKC), Lori Chisholm (DPR), Ainsley Close (MO), Jerry DeGrieck (Mayor's Office), Betsy Graef (Council Staff), Kathleen Groshong (HSD), Kacey Guin (OFE), Patricia Lee (City Council Central Staff), Catherine Lester (HSD), Grace McClelland (HSD), Holly Miller (OFE), Erica Mullen (YMCA), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Janet Jones Preston (SPS), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Dannette Smith (HSD), Noel Treat (SPS)

Tim Burgess called the meeting to order. Introductions were made. The minutes from December 13 were approved.

Wayne Barnett spoke to the members about ethics issues related to being on the LOC. He provided the following four general guidelines for members.

1. If an LOC member has a financial interest regarding a matter being discussed at the LOC, that member must disqualify himself or herself from those discussions.
2. If an LOC member is a former employee of an agency or a close friend of someone applying for funds, then that relationship needs to be disclosed.
3. No LOC member should be assisting groups seeking funds from the LOC.
4. LOC members should not receive gifts from groups or individuals seeking funds from the LOC. If they are close friends, then the LOC member needs to disclose his or her relationship and the gift that was provided.

Greg Wong asked, if you have an affiliation with a school applying for funding, do you need to exclude yourself from discussion about that school or all schools. Holly Miller clarified that the LOC doesn't make decisions on approving or granting funds to applicants of the Request for Investment (RFI) or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) processes. G. Wong asked what situations would necessitate a member excluding themselves from participating in LOC activities because of conflicts of interests. H. Miller indicated that there may be such situations but that is not clear at this point. W. Barnett clarified that if there is a relationship between an LOC member and an applicant, that relationship should be disclosed. T. Burgess indicated that members can receive advice about what is an ethics violation from W. Barnett's office.

Sid Sidorowicz provided a brief overview of the 2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan Ordinance and each of the attachments. He stated that the LOC must review the ordinance before it goes to the City Council. Kevin Washington asked, since the new Levy plan is different from the old Levy, do we know if there are providers that can meet the proposed OFE requirements. S. Sidorowicz stated that in the next few days OFE will have a better sense if organizations can meet these qualifications. Given the workshops OFE has done and the phasing of new investments, there is capacity out in the community to meet these qualifications and criteria.

Organizations who are interested and do not qualify this year can gear up and apply for RFQs and RFIs next year and in subsequent years. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked how the phase-in was created and what it looks like for the different strategies. S. Sidorowicz said OFE could give the LOC the phase-in plan for the new Levy. One issue considered for phasing-in was the capacity of OFE staff to support elementary schools coming online. In early learning, it was the city's experience with creating Step Ahead that informed how the phase-in. In summer learning, OFE looked again at previous experience in providing summer schools. OFE's greatest concern for summer learning is attracting students.

T. Burgess asked which of the health investments are delayed. S. Sidorowicz stated that mental health, dental health, Interagency and elementary are phased-in. T. Burgess also asked if we know how services will be provided, for example, for Interagency. TJ Cosgrove stated that the delay will allow them to identify a service model/strategy. The rationale for having an Interagency School-Based Health Clinic (SBHC) is because students at these schools don't typically have access to their sending school's SBHC. T. Burgess asked if the World School SBHC serves families as well as students. T. Cosgrove stated that it indeed served families offsite, but that because of the temporary site, they have not served families at the school.

Elise Chayet asked if the Implementation Plans are for the full seven years of the Levy. S. Sidorowicz said that it is for all seven years. E. Chayet suggested that as the new Federal Health Bill moves forward, we should perhaps make some amendments to the plan to include innovative strategies that are not in play at this point. Jerry DeGrieck stated that there are some opportunities to add new providers over the time of the Levy. Charles Knutson asked about the dental and the mental health enhancement phase-in. S. Sidorowicz said that dental is implemented in the 2013-14 school year along with Interagency.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if schools have the capacity to meet the criteria in the RFIs. H. Miller stated that the District has been involved in developing these plans. H. Miller also stated that OFE is contracting with Susie Murphy, former principal at Beacon Hill, to help elementary schools prepare for the RFI process. Elementary school principals also participated in the workshops last summer. Susan Enfield asked if all schools need to have hiring and firing authority. H. Miller said no, but it would be a plus for schools that do.

Sandi Everlove asked, if schools can choose to measure typical growth, how will focus students who are typically at the lowest level of academic performance ever meet standard on state assessments, especially since our students need to make more than typical growth each year. H. Miller stated that in some cases the students will have to make more than typical growth, and in other schools they will have to make greater than typical growth. S. Sidorowicz stated that we usually talk about this measure as expecting students to meet or exceed typical growth. We are looking at whether a school as a whole is meeting or exceeding typical growth. If a school can do that, then we assume that the students will eventually meet standard on state content assessments.

G. Wong asked why we don't identify MAP as an academic outcome. S. Sidorowicz said that MAP is an indicator of progress. The academic outcome is whether students are meeting standard on state assessment. OFE does use MAP as an academic outcome measure for first and second grades.

G. Wong asked for clarification on whether if schools can use an organization not qualified through the RFQ process. S. Sidorowicz said that schools cannot use Levy funds if the organization is not on the RFQ list. G. Wong stated that this varies from guidance we have provided before, and we should probably lay this out better in the paragraph on the third page of Attachment 1. S. Sidorowicz stated that OFE will make edits.

Michael DeBell stated that on the first page, since the HECB is scheduled to be phased out, references to it should probably be removed.

Cristina Gonzalez asked how we are going to be assured that Levy funds really focus on the lowest performing students. S. Sidorowicz stated that all our contract outcomes only apply to students who have not met standard in the past. For example, elementary schools would have to identify the subpopulations that are really struggling, using the data that the District provides.

C. Knutson asked about the criteria used to identify eligible elementary schools. S. Sidorowicz stated that schools at Level 1 or 2 in the district's segmentation system, or those designated as Title I schools, will be eligible. Schools that are at Level 3 but have an absolute score of Level 1 or 2 are also qualified to apply. This will capture those schools that still have struggling students but are listed as a Level 3 school. C. Gonzalez asked whether all students would be measured on the same standard regardless of the services they are provided. For example, they could be receiving middle school sports or in an after-school tutoring program and all of them would be held to the same standards. S. Sidorowicz stated that programs receiving Middle School Athletics funds do not have to meet the academic outcomes.

M. DeBell stated that there are new schools that will be opening that will not be on the SPS Segmentation Report because they don't have data yet. Isabel Muñoz-Colón stated that OFE will allow new schools to apply for RFI funds as long as they can show that their average Free and Reduced Price Lunch population and/or ELL population is above the district average. There are several schools currently that are new that will be eligible to apply this year.

T. Burgess asked about the timeline. H. Miller stated that the RFQs have gone out. The RFIs for innovation schools will go out in late February. She did not have firm dates on the early learning RFIs. H. Miller stated that Sonja Griffin was on leave and the early learning RFI had to wait until she returned. S. Sidorowicz also mentioned that OFE will be working with the District on the partnership agreement and then the data-sharing agreement. H. Miller also mentioned that SPS and OFE would co-sponsor regional discussions for schools and community-based organizations to talk about partnering and applying for RFIs.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if OFE would plan site visits at schools for new and old members to see projects at work on the ground. H. Miller said that there will definitely be opportunities for site visit. T. Burgess asked if OFE could poll members to see who would be interested and what programs they would like to see.

G. Wong asked what needs to happen to wrap up the current Levy. H. Miller said that OFE will present the mid-year report and, in subsequent meetings, we will look at first semester targets for the current school year.

Kacey Guin identified that there was an error in the data packet on 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading data on the MSP. The Level 1 and Level 2 numbers for Native American and Pacific Islander numbers should be switched.

E. Chayet asked whether LOC members would be responsible for reviewing RFQ applications between now and the next LOC meeting. H. Miller stated that the LOC members do not have to review RFQs.

S. Everlove asked how the regular public knows about the Levy and the work that the Levy does in the community. She asked if OFE advertises the success of the Levy to the broader community. She asked how the LOC members can proactively promote the work of the Levy to show how public dollars are being used. L. Gaskill-Gaddis agreed that this was a big issue. Julie McCoy stated that the Mayor's Office is trying to think of ways to expand the communications plan for the Levy. M. DeBell mentioned the Mercer Middle School article in The Seattle Times and the omission that significant funding from the City went into that school. M. DeBell suggested that, when an FEL-funded school is being highlighted, SPS and OFE need to work together on the messaging, and the role the City played in helping the school improve its outcomes.

T. Burgess stated that there has been a clear message from the voters about the importance of the Levy work. It is to the credit of the members of the LOC for helping get the Levy passed. H. Miller stated that a lot of credit should also be given to the program staff in the different departments and our other partners for helping with the passage of the Levy.